



QUESTIONS AND ISSUES SHEET - "INFUT" Program : The "Melting Pot" Boils

1. Can an individual exist in an identity apart from the group in which he has his roots? Should he define himself in terms of this group as well as in terms of universal human nature, if he is to be fully human?
2. Do attempts at universalism, brotherhood, fellowship, integration, etc. which deny or depreciate group differences do justice to the full human identity of individuals?
3. Is it possible to define a universal norm for integration which is free from the norm of the dominant or controlling group in the society doing the defining? Does such integration lead to growth or lead to stagnation of society?
4. Does an aggregate of individuals which is unjustly deprived of equal participation in society on the basis of group, as defined by themselves or others - race, religion, ethnicity, nation, class, political philosophy, etc. - have a right to organize around that group identity to struggle for justice?
5. How can persons all interact together as individuals when they consciously or unconsciously participate in a dominant group, or are denied or given privileges as a member of some other group?
6. How is it possible to develop group identity, pride and unity without denying the universal oneness? Does the universal oneness of humankind automatically preclude the goodness of separate and distinct groups?
7. How do concepts like "laissez-faire", "dog-eat-dog", "every dog has his day", "there's a sucker born every minute" etc. affect group identity?
8. Do concepts such as "brotherhood", "unity" and "community" connote the same meaning for an oppressing or dominant group that they do for an oppressed or dominated group? If not, how do their definitions differ?
9. Can a group develop something which is greater than the sum total of the individuals involved?
10. How in a pluralistic society can equal respect be assumed for every group's identity, and cultural values? Should there be legally defined rights for religious, racial and ethnic groups similar to state's rights?
11. On what basis can any group assume superiority and right to rule?
12. On what basis can the dominant group insist it can exercise self-regulation, but not acknowledge this capability in other groups?
13. Does tension between particular groups necessarily lead to irreconcilable antagonisms, or do tensions used creatively provide the dynamism for social change; in contrast to apathy and non-involvement?
14. How is it possible to have equal respect for a group, and in practice judge and control it? How can you reconcile this with the principle of human respect?
15. Is each group entitled to recognition and respect no matter how small it is, in a pluralistic society?
16. In a truly pluralistic society, what ^{form} can we expect non-controlling inter-group collaboration to take?



QUESTIONS AND ISSUES SHEET - "INPUT" Program : The "Melting Pot" Boils

1. Can an individual exist in an identity apart from the group in which he has his roots? Should he define himself in terms of this group as well as in terms of universal human nature, if he is to be fully human?
2. Do attempts at universalism, brotherhood, fellowship, integration, etc. which deny or depreciate group differences do justice to the full human identity of individuals?
3. Is it possible to define a universal ^{norm} for integration which is free from the norm of the dominant or controlling group in the society doing the defining? Does such integration lead to growth or lead to stagnation of society?
4. Does an aggregate of individuals which is unjustly deprived of equal participation in society on the basis of group, as defined by themselves or others - race, religion, ethnicity, nation, class, political philosophy, etc. - have a right to organize around that group identity to struggle for justice?
5. How can persons all interact together as individuals when they consciously or unconsciously participate in a dominant group, or are denied or given privileges as a member of some other group?
6. How is it possible to develop group identity, pride and unity without denying the universal oneness? Does the universal oneness of humankind automatically preclude the goodness of separate and distinct groups?
7. How do concepts like "laissez-faire", "dog-eat-dog", "every dog has his day", "there's a sucker born every minute" etc. affect group identity?
8. Do concepts such as "brotherhood", "unity" and "community" connote the same meaning for an oppressing or dominant group that they do for an oppressed or dominated group? If not, how do their definitions differ?
9. Can a group develop something which is greater than the sum total of the individuals involved?
10. How in a pluralistic society can equal respect be assumed for every group's identity, and cultural values? Should there be legally defined rights for religious, racial and ethnic groups similar to state's rights?
11. On what basis can any group assume superiority and right to rule?
12. On what basis can the dominant group insist it can exercise self-regulation, but not acknowledge this capability in other groups?
13. Does tension between particular groups necessarily lead to irreconcilable antagonisms, or do tensions used creatively provide the dynamism for social change? In contrast to apathy and non-involvement?
14. How is it possible to have equal respect for a group and in practice judge and control it? How can you reconcile this with the principle of human respect?
15. Is each group entitled to recognition and respect no matter how small it is, in a pluralistic society?
16. In a truly pluralistic society, what ^{form} can we expect non-controlling inter-group collaboration to take?

